UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,172	03/25/2004	Timothy S. Paek	MS307451.1/MSFTP607US	6811

27195 7590 08/23/2007
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,172	PAEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly Lovel	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are rejected.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 April 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 21 recites the limitations "the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type" and "a region of the first subset of the content associated with a first content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to a first size and another subset of the content associated with another content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to another size based on the respective content type." It is unclear where the antecedent basis exists in the specification for these limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 10-12, 15-17 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2007/0130540 to Doyle et al (hereafter Doyle) in view of US PGPub 2005/0086217 to Kraft et al (hereafter Kraft).

Referring to claim 1, Doyle discloses a computer-implemented interface for data presentation embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

a lens component [lens 410] associated with a portion of a user interface display, the lens component defines an area to display information (see [0028] and [0029]); and

a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information within the area defined by the lens component, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size as compared to information outside of the area defined by the lens (see [0028]-[0030]; [0039]; and [0043]).

While Doyle discloses that the concept of detail-in-context viewing can be applied to text (see [0024], lines 1-5), Doyle fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the user interface being applied to search results and the lens including additional textual information. Kraft discloses a user interface for allowing a user to dynamically change the detail of data (see abstract), including the further limitation of changing the amount of detail [additional text] displayed in a list of search results (see [0027], lines 1-15) in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the user interface of Doyle with the search results disclosed by Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result since detail-in-context presentations allow for magnification of a particular region of interest in a representation while preserving visibility of the surrounding representation.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Doyle and Kraft (hereafter Doyle/Kraft) discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one search engine and at least one local or remote database [web] to retrieve the search result (Kraft: see [0027], lines 2-5).

Referring to claim 3, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 1, the layout component receives user inputs that operates, alters, or selects display criteria of the lens component and other search results (Doyle: see [0030]).

Referring to claim 4, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 3, further comprising one or more parameters [lens control elements] that effect the display criteria (Doyle: see [0030], lines 1-3).

Referring to claim 5, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 4, the parameters include at least one of a lens size [size of the lens], a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a presentation rate, a delay, a trigger, or a minimum font size (Doyle: see [0030], lines 11-20).

Referring to claim 6, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one other lens component to display information. While Doyle/Kraft discloses a lens component [lens 410] (see [0028] and [0029]), Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose at one other lens component. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include at least one other lens, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Referring to claim 10, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a display option for controlling a rate of magnification [magnify lens control element] for the lens component by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target [desired level of magnification] is reached (Doyle: see [0043]).

Referring to claim 11, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 10, the subset of information displayed within the area defined by the lens component increases in size until a maximum size [level of magnification possible] is reached (Doyle: see [0043]).

Referring to claim 12, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 10, further comprising a parameter that controls a size of zoom increments [offset value] (Kraft: see [0032], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 15, Doyle/Kraft discloses the system of claim 12, further comprising a content insertion parameter that is adjusted according to a rate of insertion or according to a size of information chunks (Kraft: see [0029]).

Referring to claim 16, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a control panel to allow designers to adjust display parameters for the lens component or the layout component (Doyle: see [0034]).

Referring to claim 17, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 1, further comprising a display output associated with at least one of an instant information view or a dynamic information view (Doyle: see [0046], lines 10-14).

Referring to claim 19, Doyle/Kraft discloses a computer readable medium [tangible media] having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing the components of claim 1 (Doyle: see [0048]).

Referring to claim 20, Doyle discloses a computer-implemented system for displaying query results, comprising:

a processor [CPU 320] (see Fig 3);

means for processing in accordance with a lens [lens 410] (see [0028] and [0029]);

means for displaying at least one search result from within the lens and other search results outside the lens (see [0028], lines 5-8); and

means for animating the at least one search result displayed within the lens to magnify it in size as compared to other search results outside the lens (see [0028], lines 5-8 and [0043]).

While Doyle discloses that the concept of detail-in-context viewing can be applied to text (see [0024], lines 1-5), Doyle fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the user interface being applied to search results, each search result of the search results comprising textual information associated with the respective search result; and means for inserting additional textual information associated with the at least one search result within the lens as compared to other search results outside the lens. Kraft discloses a user interface for allowing a user to dynamically change the detail of data (see abstract), including the further limitation of each search result of the search results comprising textual information [abstract] associated with the respective search result

[URL] (see [0027]); and means for inserting additional textual information associated with the at least one search result within the lens as compared to other search results outside the lens (see [0027], lines 1-15) in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the user interface of Doyle with the search results disclosed by Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result since detail-in-context presentations allow for magnification of a particular region of interest in a representation while preserving visibility of the surrounding representation.

Referring to claim 21, Doyle discloses a method for automatic search result organization, comprising:

defining a plurality of parameters [lens control elements] for displaying search results (see [0034]);

defining a lens region [lens 410] to display at least one of the search result (see [0035]);

displaying at least one of the search results within the lens region [region of interest] and at least one other search result outside [surrounding information 210] the lens region (see [0028]);

animating the content associated with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to

content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region (see [0028], lines 5-8 and [0043]).

While Doyle discloses that the concept of detail-in-context viewing can be applied to text (see [0024], lines 1-5), Doyle fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the user interface being applied to search results; the lens including additional textual information; the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type; and a first subset of the content associated with a first content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to a first size and another subset of the content associated with another content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to another size based on the respective content type. Kraft discloses a user interface for allowing a user to dynamically change the detail of data (see abstract), including the further limitations of changing the amount of detail [additional text] displayed in a list of search results (see [0027], lines 1-15); the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type [The search engine returns a list of search results containing a list of URLs and a very brief abstract] (see [0027]); and a first subset of the content associated with a first content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to a first size and another subset of the content associated with another content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to another size based on the respective content type (see [0027] – It is inherent that the list of URLs and a very brief abstract for each URL can be written in

different font sizes) in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the user interface of Doyle with the search results disclosed by Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result since detail-in-context presentations allow for magnification of a particular region of interest in a representation while preserving visibility of the surrounding representation.

Referring to claim 22, Doyle/Kraft discloses the method of claim 21, the parameters include at least one of a lens size [size of the lens], a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a viewing rate, a delay, a trigger, and a minimum font size (Doyle: see [0030], lines 11-20).

Referring to claim 23, Doyle/Kraft discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising providing a focal center [focal region 420] for the lens region (Doyle: see [0035], lines 5-7).

Referring to claim 24, Doyle/Kraft discloses the method of claim 23, further comprising controlling a rate of magnification [magnify lens control element] for the lens region by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target [desired level of magnification] is reached (Doyle: see [0043]).

Referring to claim 25, Doyle discloses a computer-implemented graphical user interface embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

one or more data items [information] (see [0028] and [0029]);

one or more display objects created for the one or more data items (see [0028] and [0029]);

an input component [pointing device 310] for selecting the one or more data items and parameters [lens control elements] respectively associated with each of the one or more data items (see [0030], lines 8-11); and

a lens component [lens 410] to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the data items, the different format comprises animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size as compared to display objects outside of the lens component (see [0029]; [0030]; and [0043]).

While Doyle discloses that the concept of detail-in-context viewing can be applied to text (see [0024], lines 1-5), Doyle fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the user interface being applied to search results and the lens including additional textual information. Kraft discloses a user interface for allowing a user to dynamically change the detail of data (see abstract), including the further limitation of changing the amount of detail [additional text] displayed in a list of search results (see [0027], lines 1-15) in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the user interface of Doyle with the search results disclosed by Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the rate at which a user can determine a useful result since detail-in-context presentations allow for

magnification of a particular region of interest in a representation while preserving visibility of the surrounding representation.

Referring to claim 26, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 25, further comprising controls for interacting with a search engine, a database [web], the display objects or the lens component [results] (Kraft: see [0027], lines 2-5 and Doyle: see [0030]).

Referring to claim 27, Doyle/Kraft discloses the interface of claim 25, the display objects are associated with at least one of text insertion [additional information], query-relevant text insertion, thumbnails of a web page, information about a size of a result, a download speed, and a recency of a page (Kraft: see [0027]).

5. Claims 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2007/0130540 to Doyle et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0086217 to Kraft et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2002/0083101 to Card et al (hereafter Card).

Referring to claim 7, Doyle/Kraft discloses a lens component. However, Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the lens component is a fisheye lens. Card discloses displaying search results (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display (see [0081], lines 6-9 and [0114]) in order to provide the a user-friendly interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the feature of a fisheye lens as disclosed by Card with the display of Doyle/Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the a user-friendly interface.

Referring to claim 8, the combination of Doyle/Kraft and Card (hereafter Doyle/Kraft) discloses the interface of claim 7, the focal center includes one result item comprising a title, description [region 1710] (Card et al: see [0114]), and URL of a web page.

Referring to claim 9, Doyle/Kraft/Card discloses the system of claim 7, the fisheye lens is associated with a piecewise view (Card et al: see [0114]).

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2007/0130540 to Doyle et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0086217 to Kraft et al as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0030741 to Wolton et al (hereafter Wolton et al).

Referring to claim 13, Doyle/Kraft discloses zoom increments. However, Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the zoom increments are controlled with a step function. Wolton et al disclose zoom increments, including the further limitation wherein the zoom increments are controlled with a step function (see [00561], lines 3-9) in order to provide the user-friendly interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the feature of using steps to define the increments as disclosed by Wolton

et al with the display of Doyle/Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the a user-friendly interface.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2007/0130540 to Doyle et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0086217 to Kraft et al as applied respectively to claim 12 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2005/0168488 to Montague (hereafter Montague).

Referring to claim 14, Doyle/Kraft discloses a displaying content. However, Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of geometric or exponential functions that allow data to grow or settle at varying acceleration. Montague discloses displaying information (see abstract) including the further limitation of geometric or exponential functions that allow data to grow or settle at varying acceleration (see [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the feature of geometric functions as disclosed by Montague with the display of Doyle/Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the a user-friendly interface that can display different types of information.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2007/0130540 to Doyle et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0086217 to Kraft et al as applied respectively to claim 17 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2007/0156677 to Szabo (hereafter Szabo).

Referring to claim 18, while Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose wherein the dynamic view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information [additional data] associated with at least one search result [region of interest] into the detailed subset of information (see [0029]), Doyle/Kraft fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation where the detail changes according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result. Szabo discloses a user computer interface system including the further limitation where the detail changes according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result (see [0349] and [0359]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the technique of hovering as disclosed by Szabo to replace the technique of pointing disclosed by Doyle/Kraft. One would have been motivated to do so since both art provide a mouse and the act of hovering instead of clicking requires one less step by the user.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

19 August 2007
kml

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100